Arrest and Release of Members

Announcement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received a communication dated 21st October 1968 from the Superintendent of Police, Mysore District, Mysore, that Sri S. Channaiah, Member, Legislative Assembly was arrested on 18th October 1968 under Sections 353-341 I.P.C. and that he was immediately released on bail.

I have also received two communications, both dated 24th December 1968 from the Commissioner of Police, Bangalore, that Sri Vatal Nagaraj, Member, Legislative Assembly, was arrested on 24th December 1968 at 10-35 A. M. under sections 92(o) and (r) of the Mysore Police Act 1963 and that he was released on bail at 4-00 P. M. on the same day.

Resignation by Sri B. D. Jatti as Member Legislative Assembly

Announcement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to inform the House that Sri B. D. Jatti, Member, elected to the Legislative Assembly from the Jamkhandi Constituency, has resigned his seat in the Legislative Assembly with effect from 12th October 1968.

Business Advisory Committee reconstitution

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under Sub-rule (1) of the Rule 224 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly, I have reconstituted the Business Advisory Committee with the following members:

1. Hon'ble Chief Minister.
2. Hon'ble Minister for Finance, Planning and Youth Welfare.
3. Hon'ble Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs.
4. Sri K. H. Srinivasa.
5. Deputy Speaker.
6. Sri K. Sangangowda.
7. Sri S. Sivappa.
8. Sri H. Siddaveerappa.
9. Sri S. Gopala Gowda.
10. Sri H. B. Jwalanaiah.

Admission of opposition members to Ruling Party

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ ಕೆಲವರನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರೇ ಬಳ್ಳೀ ಟೋಪಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಅವರ ಸದಸ್ಯತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅವರು ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ನಿಂತು ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ಹಾಕ ಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲಚ್ಚಿನು ತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not relevant. The Hon'ble Member may please resume his seat. If any motion is to be made there is a procedure for that. If the Hon'ble member wants to say anything, let him give a notice in writing as per rules, and if it is in order, the Chair may permit it and if it is not in order, the Chair may not permit it. It is not proper for any Member to rise and say something without giving notice and cause surprise to the House. Therefore,, all that was said by Sri Vatal Nagaraj is not in order and hence not permitted.

If any Member wants to raise any matter, let him give me a notice in writing and if it is of sufficient public importance, I shall take it up and allot some time at the end of the day's work, but not in-between, so that the business of the House should not suffer. Even now the hon'ble member may give it to me in writing and I shall consider it.

Resignation of Member

Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—Sir, you were kind enough to bring to the notice of the House about the resignation of Sri B. D. Jatti, from his seat in the Legislative Assembly. I understand that Sri G. Channabasappa from Arsikere has also resigned. But, that was not reported to the House ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not received any resignation from him.

Sri K. H. PATTL (Hubli).—Sir, I have given notice under Rule 50, seeking your permission, as per rules, two hours earlier to the commencement of the Session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My office informs me that no notice is received. I shall enquire into it.

Adjournment Motion *re*: Supremes Court observations on grant of excise contract to Mr. K. V. Niranjan

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I have sent an adjournment motion regarding recent Judgement of the Supreme Court about one Excise Contractor. May I know what has happened ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received that notice. I have received two notices of adjournment motions one from Sri Nagappa and another from Sri H. M. Channabasappa. I have not given my consent for both. They might have received the intimation.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Even if the consent is withheld the Hon'ble House should know what it was according to Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will read the extract of your adjournment motion :

> " This Assembly do stand adjourned to discuss an important matter regarding the grant of Excise contract to Mr. K. V. Niranjan though he had given a lower tender than Mr. P. Bhooma Reddy, by influencing the official position by the Cabinet Ministers of the State and thereby had shown a favouritism which has caused a heavy loss and damage to the State Exchequer ".

This is the notice given by Mr. Nagappa. Two reasons have been given for rejection. The first is that the matter is not of recent occurrence. The Supreme Court gave its judgement in the month of December. The incident has occurred much earlier. The Hon'ble-member Mr. Nagappa should know I am very careful in these matters. I am the servant of the House. I cannot do injustice to the House. Both the contractors went to the High Court of Mysore and also the Supreme Court. Originally the licence was given to the contractor Mr. Bhooma Reddy. The Government felt that he did not fulfil all the conditions. It seems the notices had been issued by the Goverument and then his licence was cancelled. He went to the High Court. Mr. Niranjan also went to the High Court. Both the Petitions were rejected. While rejecting the petition of Sri Bhooma Reddy, the High Court has observed on 17th September 1968 that Mr. Niranjan's case may be considered. On 18th September 1968 Mr. Niranjan was given the contract. This House was then sitting from 2nd September 1968. The Hon'ble Member should have moved this motion in the September sitting only. Therefore, I have given this as one of the reasons for rejecting the motion. The second reason I have given for rejection is that the matter is not of urgent public importance. Further opportunities are open to the Hon'ble Member to raise this matter during the debate on Motion of Thanks. Simply because the Supreme Court has observed like that, the matter cannot be taken up now. There are ample opportunities for Members to raise these things during the debate. Therefore on these grounds I cannot give my consent. Similar adjournment motion was given by Hon'ble member Sri Channabasappa. I have withheld my consent for that also for the same reasons.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I submit one thing.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No discussion. I cannot allow anybody to speak on it.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I am not blaming the Chair. We do not want to be treated like children here, This will amount to autocracy.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What the hon'ble member said is not correct. The reasons are given as to why the consent is refused. I therefore request all the members not to raise the matter any further.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—This is not the correct way. The members should not be treated with scant respect. The Speaker was pleased to say that the same reasons as quoted were applied to my adjournment motion also. If the same reasons are applied to my adjournment motion, it would not be correct. Kindly read out my adjournment motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will follow the procedure laid down in the proviso with respect to motion moved and notice given by Mr. Channabasappa. I will read his adjournment motion:

> " That the business of the House do stand adjourned for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance *viz.*, the situation arising out of the observation made by the Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 2095/68 that " there is ground for suspecting that Government was favouring respondent No. 4.' "

The motion is similar to what Mr. Nagappa has given notice of. Hon'ble Member refers to an observation made by the Supreme Court. This observation was made on the incident which occurred on 18th September 1968.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I am very sorry Sir .....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may please resume his seat. A senior member like Sri Channabasappa should not do that.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelgola).—Mr. Channabasappa wants to know the dates on which the observations were made by the Supreme Court.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The judgement was given in the month of December, *i. e.* on 5th December 1968.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, at that time there was no Assembly in session. When the Assembly was in session the matter was *sub judice* and so, we were prohibited from bringing this matter for discussion on the floor of the House.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR (Aland).—Is it not a matter of recent occurence, Sir ?

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SHETTY (Chicknaikanahalli).—The judgement was announced on 5th December 1968.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The observation was made in relation to the occurrence of the incident. Judgement by itself does not create any urgency. Supposing a murder takes place in 1969 and the matter is being heard and judgement is given in 1970 or 1971, in which case, what is important is the occurrence of murder and not the judgement given two years later. Therefore, in this case the observations made by the Supreme Court are relevant only with reference to the incident that occurred on 18th September 1968. Hence, the matter cannot be said to be a matter of recent occurrence.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, if you say that no hon'ble Member should stand up to speak or submit further points, I am afraid, the members of this House are being treated by scant courtesy by the Chair. This cannot be tolerated any longer. I only wanted to discuss the situation arising out of the judgement delivered by the Supreme Court. So it has no relevance to the occurrence of the incident or anything of the kind. Since a grave situation has arisen on account of the judgement delivered by the Supreme Court, I wanted it to be discussed here. Then I would like to submit Sir, that I do not like to be treated like a child.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When the matter has already been disallowed by me, can the Hon'ble Member speak on the subject ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, I want to submit that there is already a precedent in this House which has the force of law and that precedent is that when a matter of grave importance like this, affecting the prestige and administration of the country has come up by way of adjournment motion, the hon. Members who have sent the adjournment motion will be called upon to show how it is urgent and what is the nature of urgency involved and how it is important, etc. After giving a hearing to the members who have sent adjournment motion, generally, the Hon'ble Speaker gives his ruling. Sometimes the Hon'ble Speaker has gone to the extent of inviting views of other members also on the question of admitting such adjournment motions. But here is an important case raised, and the Hon'ble Speaker straightaway rules out saying that no urgency is involved. If this is the treatment we are to receive, I am sorry to sumbit that we are treated with scant courtesy.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The matter under discussion is whether an observation made by the highest judiciary *i.e.*, the Supreme Court is a matter for adjournment motion or not. According to you, Sir, the matter occurred on a particular date and the decision of the Supreme Court arises out of the particular incident which took place in September 1968. But my friend Mr. Channabasappa's contention is the observations made by the Supreme Court are of importance to the Government. I do not know what the observations are. I request the Hon'ble Chair to enlighten this House regarding the observations made by the Supreme Court.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The observation is that there is a ground for suspecting that the Government was favouring respondent No. 4. I shall read the observations made both by the High Court of Mysore and the Supreme Court of India.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR (Tumkur).—The Supreme Court observed that the *bona fides* of the Government are not beyond suspicion. That means to say they are *mala fide*.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, in this case, not only the Government is criticised but even the judiciary has been criticised in the judgement. Therefore it is very important to discuss the matter in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The matter arose out of an appeal to the Supreme Court. I shall also read the observations made by the Mysore High Court.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When the Chair is giving the ruling there can be no point of order.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, why should the Hon'ble Speaker read the judgement. Let the Members who have moved the adjournment motion go through it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please sit down.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—Sir, what is relevant here is the observation made by the Supreme Court.

1-30 P. M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will read the Judgement of the Supreme Court:—

> "It is rather surprising that the Government acted so hastily and issued licences to Respondent 4 on or about September 18th. It is not quite clear how licences in respect of 1168 shops could be issued on a single day. The effect of this precipitate action on the part of the Government was that the appellant could not on the next day obtain a stay of the operation of the High Court Order. There is ground for suspecting that the Government was favouring Respondent No. 4."

Mr. Nagappa wanted to know how I could get this. When I received his notice of the motion, it is my duty to find out what the position is. The Speaker has to go through the entire matter in proper sequence and satisfy himself that there are reasons for or against. That is why I got these papers. I think it is not correct for the Hon'ble Member Mr. Nagappa to question the *bona fides* of the Speaker.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I did not question the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER.—With this, that matter is closed. I have not given my consent to the motion under Rule 50. That cannot be raised in dispute now.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—We are not questioning your ruling, Sir. But after hearing the observations of the Supreme Court which you read out, we feel that the *bona fides* of the Government have been strongly called into question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can rise this point in the course of Motion of Thanks on the Governor's Address.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—There are two courses open to this House to discuss this question regarding the *bona fides* of the Government—one is through a motion of no Confidence and the other is through an adjournment motion. If an opportunity is given by permitting the adjournment motion, we can do that. On this matter, you have given your ruling, and I am not questioning your ruling. I only request the Chair to suggest a procedure how this matter which is so important and also urgent from the point of the State, can be discussed before this House, either through an adjournment motion or through a special motion. I do not want to place the Hon'ble Speaker in an embarrassing position because the ruling has already been given. I only request the Hon'ble Speaker to ponder over this matter and suggest a procedure for this House to discuss this question.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Under Rule 54 under which I have tabled my motion, it is required that the Speaker should give reasons for rejecting the notice. Your ruling saying that it is not a matter of recent occurrence holds good in respect of the motion tabled by Mr. Nagappa. In respect of my motion, I want the Chair to give the reasons why the motion cannot be admitted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member cannot comment on the ruling of the Chair. I shall however reiterate the seasons. The first reason is that the observations made in the judgement of the Supreme Court dates back to the incident of 18th September. The observations do not exist separately from the incident. Secondly, the matter is not urgent. By urgency I mean it will not require any immediate action of an ameliorative or corrective nature as a result of the debate. No such urgent action is called for in the present case.

As regards the request made by Hon'ble Sri Sivappa, I suggest that opportunity to debate this point may be taken during the course of the debate on the motion of thanks on the Governor's Address. Hon'ble Members are welcome to make their observations, and bitter criticisms if any, on that occasion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರುದುರ್ಗ).—ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೋ ಕಾನ್‌ಫಿಡೆನ್ಸ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಸುಪ್ರೀಂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The High Court said that the action taken by the Government and the Conduct of the Government was right. When the matter went in appeal, the Supreme Court made these observations. They said there is something suspicious in the conduct of the Government in granting licences so hastily on 18th September. Probably the

Supreme Court thought that the State Government should have waited for a day or two for parties concerned to approach the Supreme Court and get a stay. You can comment on that in the course of discussion on the Governor's Address.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಸುಪ್ರೀಂಕೋರ್ಟ್ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಮಾನ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಅರ್ಜೆನ್ಸಿ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ತಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The High Court decided on 17th September. The Observations made by the Supreme Court on the conduct of the Government is on 5th December. The observations made in the month of December relate to the conduct of Government on 18th September. Therefore the matter is not urgent. That is my finding.

I have given my decision. Hon'ble Members can make their observations when they speak on the Governor's Address. They will be within their rights. The only question is, whether this matter is so very urgent as to dislocate the work on the agenda. That is the point. When an opportunity is there readily available, Hon'ble Members can easily make observations in connection with the Debate on the Governor's Address which will begin now.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, what is in question is the *bona fides* of the Government. First of all, we must be assured that the Government in power, has the confidence of this House. After reading the observations made by the Supreme Court, this House cannot have any confidence in this Government. Either you allow us to speak on the adjournment motion now tabled or please permit me to table a motion of no confidence immediately. I am going to give notice of it now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a rule relating to it and the hon'ble member has to follow it.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—This particular question is different from other issues. Here is an incident where a Contractor was forced to deposit nearly a crore of rupees and he was harassed right from June up to the date of the judgement in the Supreme Court. It is not an ordinary matter. We have got the right to persuade the Speaker to change his ruling. In fact, the judgement that is given on the 18th September by the High Court upheld the action of the Government. That judgement is reversed by the Supreme Court. While reversing that judgement, the Supreme Court makes a reflection on the administration of the Government taking into consideration the relevant factors, namely, whether Government was responsible for making a particular contractor to deposit nearly Rs. 2 crores.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why does the Member say all that? For what purpose? I have already given my ruling. So what is his intention in harping back on a point disposed of? Under Rule 50 I have disallowed

(MR. SPEAKER)

this adjournment motion. The subject is over and I cannot revise my decision. The Leader of the Opposition wanted to follow some other course. It is for him to consider that course. For that purpose, he should follow the procedure laid down in Rule 153. I will have no objection if he follows the rules and procedure thereunder.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—We have to point out the shortcomings of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is there a motion before the House in that connection ?

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—No.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then what is the meaning in the hon'ble Member interrupting and going on talking ? I have given my ruling. That is the end of it. Whether that ruling is right or wrong, it binds all the Members. If the hon. Member has any respect for the House and inasmuch as I represent the House and I give a ruling on behalf of the House, he should kindly accept the ruling of the Chair. There the matter ends.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I have a submission.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No submission now.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I bow to the ruling of the Chair. But these are all very grave matters where ruling should not be given very lightly. I am not characterising the ruling like that. We want to say how many shortcomings are there in the Government and in what way it has been working.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are welcome to do that. Didn't I tell the Hon'ble Members that they may criticise the Government in their speech on the Governor's Address ? The hon'ble Member also can do that to his heart's content when his chance for speaking on the Address comes. But not now since I have disallowed the Motion.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I want a clarification.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Channabasappa should respect the ruling of the Chair.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—All that I want to know is whether the date which is relevant has to be taken into consideration or the date on which the incident took place.

Mr. SPEAKER.—According to me, the observations do not exist separately from the incident. The observations are important and relevant only in the context of the date of occurrence of the incident ; they have no independent existence. Why does the hon'ble Member want to challenge it ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—My adjournment motion specifically states that the matter is of recent occurence and as the judgement was pronounced on 5th December.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not accept that view.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Then it is a matter for adjudication.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamenteary Affairs).—I do not want the House to understand as if I am trying to support the ruling that has been given by your kindself. The observation made by the Supreme Court relates to the action of the Government in issuing licenses in a hurry—according to them on 18-9-1968. Hon ble members are aware that on that date the House was sitting. I do not think such a senior Member as Sri Channabasappa would like to discuss an adjournment motion on the judgement of the Supreme Court.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I am not moving an adjournment motion to discuss the judgement of the High Court. There is a misrepresentation. I want the situation arising out of the pronouncement of the judgement of the Supreme Court, to be discussed. Let the hon'ble Minister interpret me correctly.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I think the hon'ble Member Sri Channabasappa heard me fully. I said that I do not think that such a senior Member like hon'ble Sri Channabasappa would like to discuss the judgement of the Supreme Court on an adjournment motion.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—He is misrepresenting me. He has made a personal reference to me. So a personal explanation from me is necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I differ. My opinion binds the House.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have a right to offer my personal explanation. The hon'ble Minister Sri Puttaswamy is making an accusation against me.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—It is not an accusation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Nobody is misrepresenting.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The hon'ble Minister is misinterpreting my statement. I have proposed to discuss the situation arising out of the judgement of the Supreme Court. But hon'ble Sri Puttaswamy says that I intend to discuss the judgement itself on an adjournment motion. What a colossal ignorance the hon'ble Minister is exhibiting!

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I thank the hon'ble member in trying to correct me. Now he says that he wants the situation arising out of the judgement, to be discussed.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is not now that I am saying. I have given it in writing.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—No situation has arisen out of the observation made by the Supreme Court. That is my opinion. What the hon. Supreme Court has observed on the action of the Government in issuing license to a certain gentleman on 18—9-1968, the House is aware and on that date the House was sitting; and if any hon'ble Member of this House felt that there was some irregularity in the Government hurrying to give a license to the Contractor, they could have raised the matter.

(SRI K. PUTTASWAMY)

Sir, your ruling is correct and the incident referred to occurred on 18-9-1968 and it is not of recent occurrence. Sir, very often it happens, the Chair will be going on giving several rulings and it may be possible for some of the hon. Members to feel different from the Chair. I only humbly request those hon'ble Members who are very much agitated on this question not to raise questions concerning the hon. Chair on the floor of the House, but to discuss them in his Chamber.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಕಾಲ್ಮಲನಯ್ಯ (ಹಾನನ).—ಸುಪ್ರೀಂ ಕೋರ್ಟು ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಚಾರಿತ್ರ್ಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಶಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ್ದು ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಚಾರಿತ್ರ್ಯ ಹೀನವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು, ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಚಾರಿತ್ರ ಹೀನವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ತನಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸಲು ತಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—Sir, I rise to a point of order under rule 54(2). If the adjournment motion is objected to, according to the rule, vote of the House should be taken and if 20 members stand in favour of the motion then the motion has to be admitted. Now that objection has been taken to the adjournment motion, it may be put to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. member Sri Kalmankar says that since objection is taken by the Minister for Law and Parliamentary Affairs, the vote of the House must be taken. Nothing can be more mistaken than this. The matter came up before me and I have given my ruling under rule 54 and I have also stated the reason. There the matter should end.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, we are now sending a Motion of No-Confidence. It is the desire of the Opposition to question the *bona fides* of the Governmnet on the floor of the House and till they are cleared by the Treasury Benches, I think, no useful purpose would be served in resuming discussion on other matters. Now we are at it and I request the Chair to take up that Motion first and dispose it of.

Mr. SPEAKER.—With respect to this 'want of confidence' matter, what to do and what not to do is left for the hon. Members. As for the Chair, I draw the attention of hon. Members to rules and to rule 153 in particular. I expect the Leader of the Opposition to follow the rules. If any notice is given, I cannot consider it now. I shall consider it tomorrow after the Question Hour is over.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, I have just followed this discussion. Not knowing the facts of the case, I was not prepared to say anything in the matter because I have not read either the judgement of the High Court or the Supreme Court. I was apprised of it only when you gave some extracts. Now, for nearly one hour this subject, in spite of your ruling, has gone on. My friends, especially the Leader of the Opposition Party thought of a No-Confidence move in this matter.

I feel, it would be a very fitting subject and in the fitness of things to consider whether the Leader of the House himself should not seek

a Vote of Confidence. That would be a better remedy than the Opposition Leader moving a Vote of no-Confidence. I am only throwing a suggestion and it is for either of them to accept whatever is relevant.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall consider the notice under the rules and if at all, it may be taken up tomorrow. Now we may go on with the work.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, Sri Siddaveerappa has suggested a very clever move. Let the Chief Minister himself raise this issue on the basis of the observation made by the highest judicial authority. Let him seek a Vote of Confidence.

2-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Since suggestions are made by Sri Channabasappa and Sri Siddaveerappa to the Leader of the House, probably the Leader of the House may consider about it. In the meanwhile we will go on with the work.

Secretary's Report

SECRETARY.—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the Bills which have received the assent of the Governor or the President, as the case may be, subsequent to the Report made during the previous Session.

STATEMENT

Showing the Bills assented to by the Governor or the President.

Sl. No.	Name of the Bill	Date of Assent	Assented by
1	The Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1968.	25th September 1968	Governor
2	The Mysore Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution and Water Rates) (Amendment) Bill, 1968.	5th October 1968	do
3	The Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1968.	11th October 1968	do
4	The Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1968	15th October 1968	do
5	The Mysore Health Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1968.	30th October 1968	do
6	The Mysore State Legislature Procedings (Protection of Publication) Bill, 1968.	3rd December 1968	President